



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/732,115

12/07/2000

Terrance J. Dishongh

42P10041

1363

45209

7590

07/26/2006

INTEL/BLAKELY

12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER

DINH, TUAN T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2841

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/732,115

Applicant(s)

DISHONGH ET AL.

Examiner

Tuan T. Dinh

Art Unit

2841

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 30-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 30-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 May 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 36-38, 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sandhu (U.S. Patent 6,084,302) in view of Funkenbusch et al, (U.S. Patent 5,108,597).

As to claims 1-2, Sandhu discloses a printed circuit board (substrate 5, column 3, lines 1-2) as shown in figures 1-3 comprising:

a dielectric board member (10, column 3, line 1); and

first and second signal lines (interconnections 15, column 2, line 67) are adjacent and supported on said dielectric board member (10), said first and second signal lines (15) including first and second elongated electrically conductive member that is enshrouded (**covered or surrounded, see specification page 3, line 9**) by carbon-based claddings (25, column 4, lines 60-61, column 5, lines 1-5) over **at least a portion** of an elongated conductive member length.

Sandhu does not specific disclose the cladding having a carbon concentration greater than 60% by weight.

Funkenbusch et al. teaches a carbon cladding having a carbon concentration greater than 60% by weight, see column 2, line 18 through column 3, line 14.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a teaching of Funkenbusch et al. employed in the PCB of Sandhu in order to provide an excellent shield and a high level resistance in the PCB.

As to claims 36-38, Sandhu discloses a printed circuit board (substrate 5, column 3, lines 1-2) as shown in figures 1-3 comprising:

a dielectric board member (10, column 3, line 1); and

first and second signal lines (interconnections 15, column 2, line 67) are adjacent and supported on said dielectric board member (10), said first and second signal lines (15) including first and second elongated electrically conductive member that is enshrouded (**covered or surrounded, see specification page 3, line 9**) by carbon-based claddings (25, column 4, lines 60-61, column 5, lines 1-5) over **at least a portion** of an elongated conductive member length.

Sandhu does not specific disclose each of the claddings having a carbon concentration greater than 60% or approximately of 99% by weight.

Funkenbusch et al. teaches a carbon cladding having a carbon concentration greater than 60% or approximately of 99% by weight, see column 2, line 18 through column 3, line 14.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a teaching of Funkenbusch et al. employed in the PCB of Sandhu in order to provide an excellent shield and a high level resistance in the PCB.

As to claim 4, Sandhu discloses said carbon-based cladding (25) of said second signal line (15) is discontinuous with said carbon-based cladding of said first signal line, see figure 3.

As to claims 5, 40, Sandhu discloses the PCB as shown in figures 1-3 further comprising a second dielectric board member (30, column 5, lines 25-27) disposed above said first dielectric board member (10) and said first signal line (15).

As to claim 8, Sandhu discloses said carbon-based cladding (25) has a dielectric constant that is greater than a dielectric constant associated with said first dielectric board member because the carbon based cladding having carbon and metal which is less resistive, and a dielectric board has a rigid resistance made of dielectric oxide.

3. Claims 30-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noorily (in the record) in view of Funkenbusch et al, (U.S. Patent 5,108,597).

As to claims 30-32, 34-35, Noorily discloses a carbon-based cladding structure as shown in figure 1 comprising:

a carbon-based cover (32, column 3, lines 23-24); and

a dielectric board member (20, column 3, line 12) having a plurality of conductor elements (26,28,30), at least one of said plurality of conductor elements, which are signal lines fully covered over top, bottom, and side portions thereof with said carbon-based cover (32), see figure 1, said cover of one of the conductive element is connected to another cover of another of the conductive elements, and a second dielectric member (14) located above the cover (32).

Noorily does not specifically disclose the cladding having a carbon concentration greater than 60% or 99% by weight.

Funkenbusch et al. teaches a carbon cladding having a carbon concentration greater than 99% by weight, see column 2, line 18 through column 3, line 14.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a teaching of Funkenbusch et al. employed in the PCB of Noorily in order to provide an excellent shield and a high level resistance in the PCB.

Regarding claim 33, Noorily discloses said carbon-based cover has a dielectric constant that is greater than a dielectric constant associated with said dielectric board member.

4. Claims 3, 6-7, 39, 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sandhu in view of Funkensusch as applied to claims 1-2, 4-5, and 8 above, and further in view of Noorily.

Sandhu and Funkenbusch disclose all of the limitations of the claimed invention, except for the cladding of the first signal line being continuous with the cladding of the second signal line and each of the claddings being covered greater than 90% of the surface of the first or second signal line (top, bottom, and sides).

Noorily teaches a carbon cladding (32) fully covered to each of signal lines (26, 28, and 30-figure 1).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a teaching of Noorily employed in the PCB of Sandhu and

Funkenbusch in order to provide a fully support, an excellent shield, and a high level resistance to the signal line in the PCB.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8, and 30-41 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan T. Dinh whose telephone number is 571-272-1929. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kammie Cuneo can be reached on 571-272-1957. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Tuan Dinh
July 19, 2006.